

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants:	Memphis-Zhihong Yin, et al.	Examiner:	Ingrid D. Wright
Serial No.:	10/758,386	Group Art Unit:	2835
Filed:	January 15, 2004	Docket No.:	200312164-1
Title:	Computer System with Multiple-Connector Apparatus		

---

**APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 10, 2007 and Notice of Appeal mailed April 10, 2007.

**AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT ACCOUNT**

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's deposit account no. 08-2025.

### **I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

### **II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no known related appeals or interferences known to appellant, the appellant's legal representative, or assignee that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Appeal Board's decision in the pending appeal.

### **III. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1 – 20 stand finally rejected. The rejection of claims 1 – 20 is appealed.

### **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

No amendments were made after receipt of the Final Office Action. All amendments have been entered.

### **V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

The following provides a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings by reference characters, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v). Each element of the claims is identified by a corresponding reference to the specification and drawings where applicable. Note that the citation to passages in the specification and drawings for each claim element does not imply that the limitations from the specification and drawings should be read into the corresponding claim element or that these are the sole sources in the specification supporting the claim features.

In one exemplary embodiment, claim 1 recites a computer system (100), comprising: a sidewall (126) having an aperture (138) therethrough (paragraphs [0016 – 0017]); and a multiple-connector apparatus (128) disposed to pass at least partially through the aperture, movable to a retracted position to conceal at least one of the connectors inside the computer system, and movable to an extended position so multiple connectors are accessible outside of the computer system for simultaneously connecting plural peripheral devices (paragraphs [0017 – 0019, 0024 – 0026]); and wherein, in the retracted position, only an outer face of the multiple-connector apparatus is exposed through the aperture (paragraph [0024]).

In one exemplary embodiment, claim 3 recites a computer system (100) comprising: a housing (114) having a top side and a sidewall (126; paragraphs [0016 – 0017]); and a retractable, extendible port connector apparatus (128) having a plurality of port connectors (130) arranged in a plane substantially parallel to the top side and adapted to receive plural mating connectors in a direction substantially parallel to the sidewall when in an extended position, and having only an outer face exposed beyond the sidewall when in a retracted position (paragraphs [0017 – 0019, 0024 – 0026]).

In one exemplary embodiment, claim 5 recites a computer system (100) comprising: a housing means (114) having an aperture (138; paragraphs [0016 – 0017]); and a means for changing (128) a total number of port connectors (130) exposed outside of the housing means (paragraphs [0016 – 0017]); and wherein: the changing means enables a plurality of the port connectors to move back and forth through the aperture and moves to an extended position outwardly from the housing for simultaneously connecting to plural peripheral devices (paragraphs [0017 – 0019, 0024 – 0026]); and the changing means is mounted inside the housing and not fully detachable from the housing means (paragraphs [0024 – 0026]).

In one exemplary embodiment, claim 7 recites a computer system (100) comprising: a housing (114; paragraph [0016]); and a connector tray (128) connected to the housing and having a plurality of port connectors (130) that simultaneously connect plural peripheral devices when the connector tray is in an extended position (paragraphs [0017 – 0019, 0024 – 0026]); and wherein: more port connectors are accessible when the connector tray is extended at least partially outside the housing than when the tray is

retracted within the housing (paragraphs [0024 – 0026]); and the connector tray is mounted inside the housing and not removable from the housing (paragraphs [0026 – 0027]).

In one exemplary embodiment, claim 8 recites a port connector mechanism for use in a computer system (100) comprising: a connector tray (128) having first and second portions (160) pivotably connected together (paragraph [0032]); a plurality of port connectors (130) disposed in the second portion of the connector tray (paragraphs [0031 – 0032]); and an extension/retraction mechanism (142) that locks the first and second portions in a retracted position until released therefrom and enables the released first and second portions to extend to an extended position at which the second portion can pivot relative to the first portion (paragraphs [0027 – 0032]).

In one exemplary embodiment, claim 11 recites a method for changing a number of accessible port connectors (130) of a computer system (100) comprising: providing the computer system with a multiple-connector tray (128) with first and second portions (160) in a retracted position relative to a housing (114) of the computer system, the multiple-connector tray having plural connectors in the second portion inaccessible in the retracted position (paragraphs [0017 – 0019, 0024 – 0026]); extending the multiple-connector tray to an extended position relative to the housing to expose the second portion (paragraphs [0025 – 0026, 0029]); and pivoting the second portion relative to the first portion to render the plural connectors accessible (paragraph [0032]).

In one exemplary embodiment, claim 14 recites a computer system (100), comprising: a retractable multiple-connector apparatus (128) that is mounted inside an aperture (138) of the computer system and not detachable from the computer system wherein the multiple-connector apparatus extends through the aperture to expose multiple connectors for simultaneously connecting plural peripheral devices (paragraphs [0017 – 0019, 0024 – 0026]).

In one exemplary embodiment, claim 19 provides the computer system as defined in claim 18 wherein the second portion of the retractable multiple-connector apparatus pivots to a vertical position relative to the housing (paragraph [0032]).

## **VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

Claims 1, 3-8, and 11-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,033,240 (Goff) in view of USPN 6,193,522 (Liao).

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,033,240 (Goff) in view of USPN 6,537,085 (Na).

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,033,240 (Goff) in view of USPN 6,537,085 (Na) and USPN 6,193,522 (Liao).

Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,033,240 (Goff) in view of USPN 6,193,522 (Liao) and USPN 5,971,777 (Garside).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,033,240 (Goff) in view of USPN 6,193,522 (Liao) and USPN 6,848,943 (Machado).

## **VII. ARGUMENT**

The rejection of claims 1 – 20 is improper, and Applicants respectfully requests withdraw of this rejection.

The claims do not stand or fall together. Instead, Applicants present separate arguments for various independent and dependent claims. Each of these arguments is separately argued below and presented with separate headings and sub-heading as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

### **Claims Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-8, and 11-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,033,240 (Goff) in view of USPN 6,193,522 (Liao). Applicants respectfully traverse.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicants assert that the rejections do not satisfy these criteria.

### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Goff in view of Liao. By way example, claim 1 recites a multiple-connector apparatus that is “movable to an extended position so multiple connectors are accessible outside of the computer system for simultaneously connecting plural peripheral devices.” Goff does not teach or even suggest a multiple-connector apparatus. The Office Action agrees stating that Goff “is silent as to a multi-connector apparatus” (see OA mailed 07/26/06 at p. 3).

In order to cure the deficiencies of Goff, the Office Action states that it would be obvious to include an additional connector slot in Goff “since this skill level requires

duplication and is well within the level of one skilled in the art” (see OA mailed 01/10/07 at p. 2). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed in the Background section of Applicants’ application, numerous previous attempts were made to accommodate the increasing number of devices that can connect to a computer. The Background provides at least five different examples of how computer makers have attempted to increase the number of port connectors that are available in computer systems. These examples even include the embodiment in Goff. Despite these efforts, computer makers and others (such as Goff and Liao) did not develop or suggest a multiple-connector apparatus that is movable to an extended position so multiple connectors are accessible outside of the computer system for simultaneously connecting plural peripheral devices as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action also relies on the multi-connector (1, 2) of Liao for allegedly teaching a connector as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. Liao shows a single adapter plug with a rotatable connector on one end in order to accommodate specifications of different countries (see Background of Liao). Liao never teaches or even suggests that this single adapter plug could be significantly modified to be retracted and extended from an aperture of a computer as recited in claim 1. Liao never even suggests using his embodiments in a computer system as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Goff in view of Liao.

### **Claim 3**

Claim 3 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Goff in view of Liao. By way example, claim 3 recites a port connector “having a plurality of port connectors arranged in a plane substantially parallel to the top side and adapted to receive plural mating connectors in a direction substantially parallel to the sidewall when in an extended position.” Goff does not teach or even suggest a connector having a plurality of port connectors. The Office Action agrees stating that Goff does not teach a connector apparatus “receiving plural mating connectors” (see OA mailed 01/10/07 at p. 3).

In order to cure the deficiencies of Goff, the Office Action states that it would be obvious to include an additional connector slot in Goff since “this skill level requires duplication and is well within the level of one skilled in the art” (see OA mailed 01/10/07 at p. 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed in the Background section of Applicants’ application, numerous previous attempts were made to accommodate the increasing number of devices that can connect to a computer. The Background provides at least five different examples of how computer makers have attempted to increase the number of port connectors that are available in computer systems. These examples even include the embodiment in Goff. Despite these efforts, computer makers and others (such as Goff and Liao) did not develop or suggest a port connector apparatus having a plurality of port connectors adapted to receive plural mating connectors in a direction substantially parallel to the sidewall of a computer system when in an extended position as recited in claim 3.

The Office Action also relies on the multi-connector (1, 2) of Liao for allegedly teaching a connector as recited in claim 3. Applicants respectfully disagree. Liao shows a single adapter plug with a rotatable connector on one side in order to accommodate specifications of different countries (see Background of Liao). Liao never teaches or even suggests that this single adapter plug could be significantly modified to be retracted and extended from an aperture of a computer as recited in claim 3. Liao never even suggests using his embodiments in a computer system as recited in claim 3.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 3 and its dependent claims are allowable over Goff in view of Liao.

### **Claim 5**

Claim 5 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Goff in view of Liao. By way example, claim 5 recites a changing means that “moves to an extended position outwardly from the housing for simultaneously connecting to plural peripheral devices.” The Office Action admits that Goff does not teach a changing means “simultaneously connected to plural peripheral devices” (see OA mailed 01/10/07 at p. 4). Applicants agree.



In order to cure the deficiencies of Goff, the Office Action states that it would be obvious to include an additional connector slot in Goff since “this skill level requires duplication and is well within the level of one skilled in the art” (see OA mailed 01/10/07 at p. 4). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed in the Background section of Applicants’ application, numerous previous attempts were made to accommodate the increasing number of devices that can connect to a computer. The Background provides at least five different examples of how computer makers have attempted to increase the number of port connectors that are available in computer systems. These examples even include the embodiment in Goff. Despite these efforts, computer makers and others (such as Goff and Liao) did not develop or suggest a changing means that “moves to an extended position outwardly from the housing for simultaneously connecting to plural peripheral devices” as recited in claim 5.

The Office Action also relies on the multi-connector (1, 2) of Liao for allegedly teaching a changing means as recited in claim 5. Applicants respectfully disagree. Liao shows a single adapter plug with a rotatable connector on one side in order to accommodate specifications of different countries (see Background of Liao). Liao never teaches or even suggests that this single adapter plug could be significantly modified to move back and forth through an aperture of a computer system as recited in claim 5. Liao never even suggests using his embodiments in a computer system as recited in claim 5.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 5 and its dependent claims are allowable over Goff in view of Liao.

### **Claim 7**

Claim 7 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Goff in view of Liao. By way example, claim 7 recites a connector tray “having a plurality of port connectors that simultaneously connect plural peripheral devices when the connector tray is in an extended position.” The Office Action even states that Goff does not teach “port connectors that simultaneously connect plural peripheral devices” (see OA mailed 01/10/07 at p. 5).

In order to cure the deficiencies of Goff, the Office Action states that it would be obvious to include an additional connector slot in Goff (see OA mailed 01/10/07 at p. 5). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed in the Background section of Applicants' application, numerous previous attempts were made to accommodate the increasing number of devices that can connect to a computer. The Background provides at least five different examples of how computer makers have attempted to increase the number of port connectors that are available in computer systems. These examples even include the embodiment in Goff. Despite these efforts, computer makers and others (such as Goff and Liao) did not develop or suggest a connector tray having a plurality of port connectors that simultaneously connect plural peripheral devices when the connector tray is in an extended position as recited in claim 7.

The Office Action also relies on the multi-connector (1, 2) of Liao for allegedly teaching a connector as recited in claim 7. Applicants respectfully disagree. Liao shows a single adapter plug with a rotatable connector on one side in order to accommodate specifications of different countries (see Background of Liao). Liao never teaches or even suggests that this single adapter plug could be significantly modified to be retracted and extended from a computer system as recited in claim 7. Liao never even suggests using his embodiments in a computer system as recited in claim 7.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 7 is allowable over Goff in view of Liao.

### **Claim 8**

Claim 8 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Goff in view of Liao. By way example, claim 8 recites a connector tray having first and second portions with a plurality of port connectors disposed in the second portion. Claim 8 then recites that the first and second portions "extend to an extended position at which the second portion can pivot relative to the first portion." The Office Action even states that Goff does not teach a "second portion being pivotable and a plurality of connectors in the second portion" (see OA mailed 07/26/06 at p. 5). The Office Action attempts to cure these deficiencies with Liao. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Liao shows a single adapter plug with a rotatable connector on one end. **The adapter in Liao is one-piece that pivots at an end.** In other words, Liao does not teach or even suggest two portions that extend to a position at which the second portion can pivot relative to the first portion.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 8 and its dependent claims are allowable over Goff in view of Liao.

#### **Claim 11**

Claim 11 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Goff in view of Liao. By way example, claim 11 recites a multi-connector tray “having plural connectors in the second portion inaccessible in the retracted position.” Goff does not teach or even suggest a multiple-connector tray. The Office Action agrees stating that Goff “is silent as to a multi-connector apparatus” (see OA mailed 07/26/06 at p. 3).

Liao shows a single adapter plug with a rotatable connector on one side in order to accommodate specifications of different countries (see Background of Liao). Liao never teaches or even suggests that this single adapter plug could be significantly modified to be extended from a computer system and then a portion pivoted as recited in claim 11. Liao never even suggests using his embodiments in a computer system as recited in claim 11.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 11 and its dependent claims are allowable over Goff in view of Liao.

#### **Claims Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,033,240 (Goff) in view of USPN 6,537,085 (Na). Applicants respectfully traverse.

#### **Claim 14**

Claim 14 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Goff in view of Na. By way example, claim 14 recites a multiple-connector apparatus that “extends through the aperture to expose multiple connectors for simultaneously

connecting plural peripheral devices.” Goff does not teach or even suggest a multiple-connector apparatus. The Office Action agrees stating that Goff “is silent as to a multi-connector apparatus” (see OA mailed 07/26/06 at p. 3).

In order to cure the deficiencies of Goff, the Office Action states that Na teaches a multi-connector (200) that simultaneously connects plural peripheral devices. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As shown in figures 8 and 9, Na teaches a portable electronic apparatus that has a dual connector 200 fixed to the housing. The connector 200 in Na is fixed and is not “retractable” as recited in claim 14. Further, the connectors 200 are flush with the housing and thus do not extend through an aperture to expose multiple connectors as recited in claim 14.

As discussed in the Background section of Applicants’ application, numerous previous attempts were made to accommodate the increasing number of devices that can connect to a computer. The Background provides at least five different examples of how computer makers have attempted to increase the number of port connectors that are available in computer systems. These examples even include the embodiment in Goff and Na. Despite these efforts, computer makers and others (such as Goff and Na) did not develop or suggest a multiple-connector apparatus that extends through the aperture to expose multiple connectors for simultaneously connecting plural peripheral devices as recited in claim 14.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 14 and its dependent claims are allowable over Goff in view of Liao.

**Claims Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,033,240 (Goff) in view of USPN 6,537,085 (Na) and USPN 6,193,522 (Liao). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 18-20 depend from independent claim 14. Liao fails to cure the deficiencies of Goff and Na. For at least the reasons given with independent claim 14, dependent claims 18-20 are allowable.

Further, claim 19 recites that the second portion of the retractable multiple-connector apparatus “pivots to a vertical position relative to the housing.” Nowhere does the art of record teach or even suggest a multiple-connector that pivots to a vertical position relative the housing. The Office Action cites Goff, Na, and Liao for teaching this recitation. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of these references show or suggest a multiple connector that pivots to a vertical position relative to the housing.

**Claims Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,033,240 (Goff) in view of USPN 6,193,522 (Liao) and USPN 5,971,777 (Garside). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, and claim 9 depends from independent claim 8. Garside fails to cure the deficiencies of Goff and Liao. For at least the reasons given with independent claims 1 and 8, respective dependent claims 2 and 9 are allowable.

**Claims Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,033,240 (Goff) in view of USPN 6,193,522 (Liao) and USPN 6,848,943 (Machado). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 10 depends from independent claim 8. Machado fails to cure the deficiencies of Goff and Liao. For at least the reasons given with independent claim 8, dependent claim 10 is allowable.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the Board of Appeals to reverse the Examiner's rejection of all pending claims.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**Hewlett-Packard Company**  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren  
Reg. No. 40,709  
Ph: 832-236-5529

### **VIII. Claims Appendix**

1. A computer system, comprising:

- a sidewall having an aperture therethrough; and
- a multiple-connector apparatus disposed to pass at least partially through the aperture, movable to a retracted position to conceal at least one of the connectors inside the computer system, and movable to an extended position so multiple connectors are accessible outside of the computer system for simultaneously connecting plural peripheral devices;

- and wherein, in the retracted position, only an outer face of the multiple-connector apparatus is exposed through the aperture.

2. A computer system as defined in claim 1 further comprising:

- a push-push mechanism facilitating movement of the multiple-connector apparatus.

3. A computer system comprising:

- a housing having a top side and a sidewall; and
- a retractable, extendible port connector apparatus having a plurality of port connectors arranged in a plane substantially parallel to the top side and adapted to receive plural mating connectors in a direction substantially parallel to the sidewall when in an extended position, and having only an outer face exposed beyond the sidewall when in a retracted position.

4. A computer system as defined in claim 3 wherein:

- the sidewall has an aperture; and
- the port connector apparatus includes an extension/retraction mechanism that enables the port connector apparatus to be extended and retracted through the aperture.

5. A computer system comprising:

- a housing means having an aperture; and

a means for changing a total number of port connectors exposed outside of the housing means;

and wherein:

the changing means enables a plurality of the port connectors to move back and forth through the aperture and moves to an extended position outwardly from the housing for simultaneously connecting to plural peripheral devices; and

the changing means is mounted inside the housing and not fully detachable from the housing means.

6. A computer system as defined in claim 5 further comprising:

a means for holding the port connectors in a retracted position relative to the housing; and

a means for releasing the port connectors from the retracted position relative to the housing.

7. A computer system comprising:

a housing; and

a connector tray connected to the housing and having a plurality of port connectors that simultaneously connect plural peripheral devices when the connector tray is in an extended position;

and wherein:

more port connectors are accessible when the connector tray is extended at least partially outside the housing than when the tray is retracted within the housing; and

the connector tray is mounted inside the housing and not removable from the housing.

8. A port connector mechanism for use in a computer system comprising:

a connector tray having first and second portions pivotably connected together;

a plurality of port connectors disposed in the second portion of the connector tray;

and

an extension/retraction mechanism that locks the first and second portions in a



retracted position until released therefrom and enables the released first and second portions to extend to an extended position at which the second portion can pivot relative to the first portion.

9. A port connector mechanism as defined in claim 8 wherein:

the extension/retraction mechanism comprises a push-push mechanism.

10. A port connector mechanism as defined in claim 8 further comprising:

an actuator button that, upon activation, causes the extension/retraction mechanism to release the connector tray from the retracted position.

11. A method for changing a number of accessible port connectors of a computer system comprising:

providing the computer system with a multiple-connector tray with first and second portions in a retracted position relative to a housing of the computer system, the multiple-connector tray having plural connectors in the second portion inaccessible in the retracted position;

extending the multiple-connector tray to an extended position relative to the housing to expose the second portion; and

pivoting the second portion relative to the first portion to render the plural connectors accessible.

12. A method as defined in claim 11 further comprising:

releasing the multiple-connector tray from the retracted position.

13. A method as defined in claim 11 further comprising:

retracting the multiple-connector tray back to the retracted position.

14. A computer system, comprising:

a retractable multiple-connector apparatus that is mounted inside an aperture of the computer system and not detachable from the computer system wherein the multiple-

connector apparatus extends through the aperture to expose multiple connectors for simultaneously connecting plural peripheral devices.

15. A computer system as defined in claim 14 further comprising:

a housing;

and wherein the retractable multiple-connector apparatus is integrated with the housing.

16. A computer system as defined in claim 14 wherein:

the retractable multiple-connector apparatus retracts entirely into the computer system.

17. A computer system as defined in claim 14 further comprising:

a housing;

and wherein the retractable multiple-connector apparatus retracts within the housing to a position at which a remote side of the retractable multiple-connector apparatus is flush with a wall of the housing.

18. A computer system as defined in claim 14 further comprising:

a housing;

and wherein the multiple-connector apparatus has a first portion and a second portion, the second portion pivots relative to the housing upon being extended from the housing.

19. A computer system as defined in claim 18 wherein:

the second portion of the retractable multiple-connector apparatus pivots to a vertical position relative to the housing.

20. A computer system as defined in claim 19 wherein:

the retractable multiple-connector apparatus further comprises a plurality of connectors accessible from a side away from the housing of the computer system.

**IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

None.

**X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

None.